

REMARKS

Pending Claims

Claims 1-17 are pending. Claims 1, 10 and 14 have been amended. Support for the amendments are found in the specification and the original claim (e.g. claim 2). Claim 10 has been amended to incorporate the elements of claim 1. No new matter has been added. Claim 2 has been canceled. Claim 18 has been added. Claim 18 is supported by the specification and the original claims. No new matter has been added.

Drawings

Claim 6 has been amended to delete the phrase, “container on which a series of sheets for wrapping is wound.”

Fig. 1 has been amended to include Arabic numerals.

Figs. 21 and 22 have been amended to include the legend, “PRIOR ART.”

Withdrawal of the objections to the claims is respectfully requested.

Specification

The specification has been objected to for allegedly not having support for “has a fine projection at least on an internal surface of said main body” as in claim 5 because the specification only disclosed fine projection on an internal surface of said main body (see Fig. 3).

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, for the reasons set forth in the objection to the specification.

Claim 5 has been amended to state “the main body has a fine projection on an internal surface of said main body.” Withdrawal of the objection to the specification and the rejection to claim 5 are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112

Withdrawal of the rejections against the cited claims is respectfully requested based on the above amendments.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

Claims 1 and 8-10 have been rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Leeker (H1363).

Claim 1 recites as follows:

Claim 1 (currently amended): An individual wrapping container for wrapping individually an interlabial pad to be held between labia, comprising:
a main body for containing said interlabial pad; and
a cover that covers a part of said main body, the cover forming an unwrapping portion at an end edge portion to be unwrapped to open the individual wrapping container;
wherein said cover is shaped to have a cut portion at a place where said individual wrapping container is held when the individual wrapping container is opened, and
wherein the individual wrapping container has predetermined region where a finger of a wearer is applied, and
said end edge of said cover is curved or beveled to a bottom of the individual wrapping container.

At least the above bolded feature is not disclosed, taught or suggested by the cited prior art reference.

Leeker discloses a fold and wrap package for containing a catamenial pad prior to use and for conveniently and securely disposing of a soiled catamenial pad. In contrast, claim 1 as amended has a limitation, "said end edge of said cover is curved or beveled to a bottom of the individual wrapping container." Leeker does not disclose, teach, or suggest this feature. For example, see Figs. 2, 4, and 5 which show a wrap package with straight end edges. Therefore, for at least the above reason, Leeker does not anticipate the presently claimed invention.

Claims 8 and 9, which depend from claim 1 directly or indirectly, are not anticipated for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claim 10 has been amended to incorporate the elements of claim 1. Therefore, for at least the same reasons as claim 1, claim 10 is not anticipated by the cited prior art.

Claims 1, 2, and 10 have been rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Srinivasan et al. (USP 3,973,567).

Srinivasan et al. discloses a sanitary napkin having an adhesive element for attaching to a undergarment. The reference also discloses a means for protecting the napkin and the adhesive element prior to use and for disposing of the napkin after use. However, Srinivasan et al. also does not disclose the bolded feature of claim 1 as indicated above. Srinivasan's Figs. 1-14 all show a wrapping package with straight edges. Therefore, Srinivasan et al. also does not anticipate claim 1.

Claim 2, which depends from claim 1, also is not anticipated by Srinivasan et al. for at least the same reason as claim 1. Claim 10 is not anticipated for at least the same reason as claim 1.

Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 10, and 14 have been rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Farris et al. (USP 6,131,736).

Farris et al. discloses an individual package in combination with an absorbent interlabial device. As shown in Figs. 1 and 2, Farris et al. shows a re-sealable individual package 40 for an

Farris et al. does not disclose, teach, or suggest a cover that “is shaped to have a cut portion at a place where said individual wrapping container is held when the individual wrapping container is opened” as set forth in claim 1. (Emphasis added.) At least for the above reason, Farris et al. does not anticipate the presently claimed invention as set forth in claim 1.

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by the published Japanese Patent Application, No. 2000-051265 to Kao.

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Akemi et al. (USP 5,505,306).

[illegible]

being curved or beveled to a bottom of the individual wrapping container as set forth in claim 5. See Akemi's Figs. 1 to 21. Therefore, for at least this reason, claim 5 is not anticipated by Akemi.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 6 and 12 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan et al. or Farris et al.

Claim 6 depend from claim 1 and claim 12 depend indirectly from claim 10. Therefore, claim 6 is not obvious for at least the same reason that claim 1 is neither anticipated by nor obvious from Srinivasan et al. or Farris et al. Claim 12 is not obvious for at least the same reason that claim 10 is neither anticipated by nor obvious from Srinivasan et al. or Farris et al.

New Claim

Claim 18 has been added. Applicants submit that the elements of claim 18 are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by any of the cited references.

Obviousness-type Double Patenting

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 1-10, 12, and 14 have been provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of US Patent Application No. 10/705,669. Because of the provisional nature of this rejection, Applicants propose to address this rejection when all of the pending claims of this application are allowable except for this rejection.

Application No. 10/705,781
Amendment dated October 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of

Docket No.: 20050/0200483-US0

In view of the above amendment, applicant request that the pending application be allowed.

Dated: October 21, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Chris Mizumoto
Chris T. Mizumoto

Registration No.: 42,899

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant